APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,418	11/24/2003	Wesley A. Brush	Brush 113579 cont.	3406

7590   02/18/2009

Henry T. Brendzel
P.O. Box 574
Springfield, NJ 07081

EXAMINER
ADDY, THJUAN KNOWLIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed **01/29/2009** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.   In regards to claim 1, and similarly to claim 2, Applicants' argue that Sattar does not disclose "clause" a, b, c, or d of claim 1.

3.   Applicants argue that the phrase "which message specifies a communication protocol parameter" means that the message specifies a parameter that pertains to a communication protocol, which means that the parameter specifies the communication protocol. In response to this argument, Examiner still maintains the position that the instructions/data package of Sattar, may simply read on the "parameter". For instance, the instructions/data package sent to IP 42, via SCP 24, indicates what services are required or needed for the calling party, which may include fax retrieval, voice recognition, text-to-voice functions, digit collection, etc., (See col. 7 lines 18-33) of Sattar. For example, faxing, voice, and text-to-voice conversion, each require a different type of "communication protocol." In Sattar, the instructions/data package specifies the "communication protocol," (such as the protocol needed for faxing, voice, or text-to-voice conversion) and therefore, reads on "a communication protocol parameter".

4.   Applicants "agree that an instructions/data package is sent to IP 42 by SCP 24, but disagree that an instructions/data package is sent to IP 42 by switch 10 via SCP". Sattar, however, does disclose that the instructions/data package may be sent to IP 42

by switch 10 via SCP. For instance, Sattar discloses that alternatively, data
communication between SCP 24 and IP 42 may be routed through switch 10 using
voice and data link 44, data link 28, STP 26, and data link 30 (See col. 7 lines 4-6).

5.   In regards to claim 1, Sattar discloses each clause. Claim 1 simply recites, and
Sattar discloses, an intelligent peripheral (See Fig. 2 and intelligent peripheral (IP) 42)
receiving an alert message, (e.g., instructions/data package) from a database unit (See
Fig. 2 and SCP 24), the message specifies a communication protocol parameter (for
example, the instructions/data package sent to IP 42, via SCP 24, indicates what
services are required or needed for the calling party, which may include fax retrieval,
voice recognition, text-to-voice functions, digit collection, etc., See col. 7 lines 18-33);
with reference to a database within said intelligent peripheral, establishing a connection
between said database unit and said intelligent peripheral to operate in accord with a
protocol pointed to by said protocol parameter, communicating information between
said database unit and said intelligent peripheral; and communicating information
between a switch (See Fig. 2 and switch 10) and said intelligent peripheral over a
bearer connection (See Fig. 2 and data link 44) between them (See col. 7 lines 44-66).

6.   In response to Applicants' argument in regards to claim 3, that Sattar does not
disclose "a parameter of a protocol that uniquely specifies a protocol" and "operating
parameter of said protocol", Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the cited
passages col. 7 lines 18-27 and col. 7-8 lines 64-5 do not mention the word "protocol",
does not mean that the limitation of claim 3 is not taught by Sattar within those

passages. For instance, voice, text-to-voice, fax, etc., all require a unique/different

"protocol".

/Thjuan K. Addy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614